

***Timber Point Environmental Assessment  
Public Meeting Transcripts  
October 21, 2104– Evening Session***

***Number of attendees from the public: 19***

***Meeting Format:***

- I. Introductions by Roger Cole, Moderator***
- II. Presentation by Ward Feurt, Refuge Manager - Rachel Carson National Wildlife Refuge, on alternatives in the Environmental Assessment***
- III. Question and Answer Session (transcribed below)***
- IV. Statements from Attendees on the Environmental Assessment (transcribed below)***
- V. Wrap up***

***Question and Answer Session (Transcription)***

*(Start at recording 16:04 minutes)* Roger Cole: So we have a brief time now. Welcome to the new people that came in. We are going to have a brief question and answer period here now, and then we will primarily have a comment period where we hear from you. But as this point, if anybody has any questions about what you just heard, or what you have read about the EA, just raise your hand and I will ask you for your name. We will record your name, I believe. And we will take it here. Yes ma'am.

Sara Carter: I am Sara Carter, and I wonder what you said about “going to give them the buildings” if you go with the plan D, I think it is? Does that literally mean you will give them the buildings?

Ward Fuert: Under D, they'll remove them. I think what I said is that they can have the buildings, but they couldn't leave them there.

Sara: You have to remove them. So, what are we looking at in terms of removing the buildings? Are we looking at building new roads?

Ward: Here is the one thing I know about it. One of our partners was interested in that. He went out there with a guy that moves buildings. I did not want to participate in that, because we are not prejudging this at all. This is a draft. We go through this process of...here is the draft of the environmental [assessment], we collect comments from people, there is the normal kind of (back and forth?), and then we end up with the final product. So, I didn't want to do anything that like, prejudged it. But I was interested in that so I just, so I tagged along. The building can be moved. The main house can be moved.

Sara: Without increasing the road...?

Ward: And he said, well, that is going to be expensive, but all I was listening for was, can it be done? And this guy whose job is moving buildings, said yes. Even, he wasn't hesitant, so that is what I learned.

Unknown female: What was the answer to the question? The question was about the road.

Ward: I thought she said...

Sara: I was concerned about the infrastructure to move it. Was it there? Would they have to resurface the road to move it?

Ward: I think he was thinking of moving by water.

Sara: Oh, cool.

Roger: Please direct your comments to me and then I will pass them around to them. I appreciate it. Yes, sir?

Greg Tarbox: I was just curious so, if you went with plan D... Does that mean that it sort of reverts to plan A, where there is the same kind of maintenance? What happens to the main point? You said that plan A was the current plan. Plan D...what happens when you get rid of the buildings? How...how is the land treated after that?

Ward: It was alluded to in one of those slides, its planting of native habitat, full lands restored.

Greg Tarbox: So it is kind of like A?

Ward: Right, it is kind of like A, without the building part.

Roger: Can you state your name, please?

Greg Tarbox: I am sorry, Greg Tarbox.

Roger: Thank you. Yes, sir. Your name please?

Doug McCrae: My name is Doug McCrae, and I think it may have been somewhere in the environmental assessment, but I didn't take it in. Can you summarize the costs, the one-time costs, and the ongoing costs for each of the four options?

Ward: You know I can't do it off the top of my head. The current management..it's going to be something similar to doing whatever we do right now, unless we have to discontinue some things. Alternative B, boy I hope I get this right. It was somewhere in the neighborhood of \$200,000...

Unidentified male speaker: \$390,000 and \$130,000 thereafter.

Ward: \$390,000 to start with, and actually it comes out to be both \$130,000. I think it comes out to be about \$200,000 a year for operations from \$80,000 a year roughly. Why don't we just look at the document?

Nancy: Want to reference the document?

Ward: We do, please answer the guys question.

Nancy: So under alternative A, the current management estimated annual maintenance is \$23,000. Alternative B, which is preserve the exterior of the buildings and do some interpretation, the initial costs to bring the buildings to preservation status is ...\$390,000 and an annual maintenance budget, thereafter, is \$35,000. Again, this is all in the chapter 3 summary description table of the alternatives. Alternative C, which is adaptive reuse of the buildings, the initial cost is estimated to rehabilitate and to establish a visitor contact facility, meeting rooms, offices, and overnight accommodations, is \$3.2 million, estimated annual maintenance after that is \$80,000. And, another cost associated with that is a Service staff dedicated to that. In alternative D, the cost estimated to remove the buildings, and it was basically an estimate for demolishing the buildings, was \$180,000.

Ward: We had a study done, contracted, a condition assessment of all the gross structures. It was done by Oak Point Associates of Biddeford. They do this for Fish and Wildlife Service and others. And so, it looked at what the current condition is, and then go from there to bring it up to today's standards. So, we use those figures. And a Service engineer did the projections of what the ongoing costs would be. So, that was in the study.

Greg: So, what is that as a percentage of the preserve as a whole?

Ward: The annual budget for the refuge is around a million dollars.

Greg: Thank you.

Roger: Yes, your name please?

Aurelie Wallach: Aurelie Wallach. I was curious about the estimated numbers of visitors, specifically; they are quite a bit higher than what I would have thought. And I am wondering about how those figures were gathered and if you feel they are accurate? Because I think the gathering of that information is a bit fragmented.

Ward: We have had present volunteers who have been working at Timber Point for the last couple of years, and so, the very first figures we got were their estimates from two years ago. Gary, are you keeping me straight here? And this year, because we were interested in exactly that question, one of the things we requested as one of their duties is to collect visitor data again, so from when they got there in May from when they left in September.

They were collecting daily data on participation. One of the things we saw in the numbers was that they weren't counting like cars or walkers, they were counting everyone. And many more people crossed from Goose Rocks in low water than I would have thought. Many more, and at low tide, and good weather, it's big numbers. So that was a surprise.

Roger: Questions? Go ahead.

Sara Carter: Sara Carter. So do you anticipate that Plan C would generate income, from the partner?

Ward: Oh, we are not a profit organization. We would not be able to answer that question. We don't look at that number.

Sara: Would your partner in that scenario? We are going to upgrade this facility. Would your partner move in?

Ward: It's not going to be a money maker on the refuge. No, you know we don't do commercial...No.

Sara: Okay.

Roger: Ok, so we are going to close the question period. So let's get...Got a hand going up?

Virginia McCrae: This may have been answered before I got here, but where does the property stand in terms the National Register of Historic Places right now.

Graham Taylor: So, we have a nomination that we received that was drafted from a private organization that was donating their time in developing that. We are reviewing that right now, and we are going to be working with the State Historic Preservation Office to come together with an agreed upon nomination package that will move forward. So, then the State Office of Preservation processes that and it will go out for public review and comment. They have their process, and it will probably take the comments on that nomination package. And that gets sent to the National Park Service, who is the keeper of the National Park Register, and that process, I am not that familiar with. But, it is working along on a separate tract from this EA process, because it is a different piece and it's going to take a different amount of time, you know, and we didn't want to hold up one process up for another, so...

Virginia: Doesn't the choice of alternatives depend upon that status?

Graham: What we did when we developed all of the alternatives, we went with the premise that all the structures out there would be eligible for the National Historic Register. So, it doesn't really effect which alternative we select, in a sense that, if alternative D was selected, there is still a process we would have to go through to document the buildings, the structures, for the record and then, you know, then work with the State Historic Preservation Office to come to an

agreement of what needs to be done for that. So, that will have to take place prior to any implementation of alternative D, if that was the alternative picked.

Virginia: You could still have alternative D even though it became part of the National Register?

Graham: Alternative D, let's say for instance alternative D was the alternative that got selected, the process, it doesn't go forward until the National Historic Register process has been completed, and then we've documented the structures that would then be either removed or demolished.

Virginia: Okay.

Unidentified male speaker: Basically, if it's in the registry it could still be demolished as long as it is documented?

Graham: Yeah

Roger: That's well said.

Graham: We just happen to haul it.

Unidentified male speaker: So the alternative isn't predicated on any potential outcome after how long it takes for that potential for it to be preserved?

Graham: Right.

Roger: Hold on, I see someone that hasn't spoken, Right here sir. Name please.

John Wallach: John Wallach. I guess I just didn't understand the clarification. If the property did get historic preservation status, could it still be removed?

Graham: Yes, I mean it still could be removed. There's a process that has to be gone through. When I was working in the field we had, there's properties in New Hampshire, there was a property that had gone through the National Historic Register, but I mean it was in very bad shape and the New Hampshire State Historic Preservation Office, we had an agreement was to document all that entailed, and once that was satisfied then we could move forward with removal of the building in whatever form that is.

Nancy M.: If I can refer people to the document. Our description of alternative D on page 36 describes, there's a six step process we would have to follow. There is some justification involved with the State Historic Preservation Office to go through a demolition process. So, that process that is required is described in this document. So, it is not a done deal. Even if we were to pick that alternative, we would have to get through this process with SHPO for it to be implemented.

Roger: Hold on. You had your hand up earlier. You haven't spoken yet. Go ahead.

Josephine Powers: I just want to let people in the room to know that according to Christy Mitchell, at the Maine Historic Preservation Commission, the process is in the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's hands. The Maine Historic Commission has not heard from them since August 10<sup>th</sup>. The Service currently is reviewing the updated draft of the National Historic Register nomination with an expectation of proceeding with the nomination, which is what Fish and Wildlife Service wrote to Christy. She wrote, it is up to Fish and Wildlife to move the nomination forward if and when they choose to do so. She also said if they have a disagreement with their assessment, then it hasn't been communicated to them.

Roger: Okay, thank you for that.

Graham: So we are working through that. Our archeologist position was vacated. And it just got filled last week. So, that is part of the process, and we are working with our Washington Office. We are working on this...it is just taking a little time is all. But again, the EA is not hung up on the nomination process.

Roger: Good thank you Graham. Yes ma'am.

Virginia McCrae: Two questions. Would that be a priority for your new archeologist?

Graham: The Archeologist is working in 13 states. We think it is a high priority, but I don't supervise that individual.

Virginia McCrae: Thank you. Sometimes a nudge is helpful. The second question: Will you be able to reveal name of the nonprofit partner that you alluded to?

Graham: The nonprofit??

Ward: We don't have the nonprofit.

Graham: There is nobody in mind, there is just the potential.

Virginia McCrae: Have you received some suggestions?

Graham: We have, but nobody, nothing has been decided. It's an alternative and it's a concept. You know, it's an idea, so, you know, if we go down that path, if Alternative C was implemented, there would be a whole process, then we would identify a whole range of potential partners that might be interested in partnering with us.

Virginia McCrae: Would you say that you have expanded on some of the suggestions? With alternative C, have you expanded on any suggestions that you've received so that the project looks a lot bigger than any suggestions that have may been made before?

Ward: Alternative C is one of four , is just one of the reasonable alternatives put forth. I think I am not answering your question.

Virginia McCrae: So, it's a range then?

Ward: Yes

Roger: Yes, sir. Hi!

Tom Craven: My question is...

Roger: Your name please?

Tom Craven: Oh, I'm sorry. Tom Craven. I'm from Biddeford.

Roger: Thank you.

Tom Craven: The dollar amounts that were included in the alternatives, would that be Federal funds? For example, the \$3.2 million for Alternative C, would that come out of Federal funds?

Ward: The way that the alternative is written, it is working with partners in order to implement. The cost is \$3.2 million. There hasn't been any talk about your share, my share. No, I haven't heard that at all.

Tom Craven: That begs the question, if Alternative C is chosen, how do you know if the funding is going to be available if it is not within the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service budget?

Ward: Well, Fish and Wildlife's budget overall is larger than \$3.2 million. It is not reasonable to assume that in its largesse...that it will all be given to Rachel Carson Refuge. The way that appropriated funds work is, it's an annual appropriation, and Congress is quite cherry of that power. They don't like it when I say, "I'll pay you \$50 this year, and I'll pay \$50 next year", because their response is, "We haven't given you the \$50 for next year." So, we work on the basis of annual appropriations. I mean, this is our government. It's not just U.S. Fish and Wildlife. We work on the basis of annual appropriation. We do have maintenance plans and maintenance plans with backlogs, you know, the projects that are lined up to what we will be proposing into the future. And, something as big as this restoration would become part of that maintenance schedule.

Roger: Hold on let's see. This gentleman.

David Marvick: David Marvick from Biddeford. I am just trying to think through the historic preservation as an historic building can increase the costs to renovate the buildings if it's under the Historic Register because you would have to follow certain criteria to do that. As a taxpayer, I am trying to figure out, why is Fish and Wildlife taking that approach that is going to increase their costs overall? I just don't quite understand the reasoning behind going through that process, I guess.

Ward: The process, this 106 Historical Register process. That is a process that kind of runs parallel; it is not this environmental assessment. So, this environmental assessment is looking at a range of alternatives, you know, a reasonable range of alternatives. In parallel to that...these buildings are likely eligible for the Historical Register. I think they are, and all of our planning thinks that they are. Our alternatives are not dependent on that process, and that process is not dependent on our alternatives. This is a parallel track that they are running on. It would, in fact, be more expensive to restore a building on the Historic Register, than it would be like my house or something like that. But, it's not a kind of a choice. We can't say, "Oh, let's not put it on the Register because then we could repair it much more reasonably." It's not a choice. Two processes are running parallel.

Roger: Yes, sir.

Bill Durkin: In alternative C, would you follow Biddeford's local land use ordinance and zoning or would you go with the Federal way?

Roger: That is a kind of comment relating more to Biddeford than the EA we are working on right now, I believe.

Bill Durkin: In the choice of C, if you are going to be rectifying the building and changing a use and be involved in the whole regulatory process, would that be allowed, is it really a choice?

Roger: I would suggest we put that as a comment you would like to raise to hear back on when we get the comments back in December. Because it is a little early right now. I imagine there will be several regulatory agencies that will have to weigh in on most of the alternatives, I would assume.

Bill Durkin: Is alternative C really an option? Why would you go that way if its not going to be a real alternative.

Roger: Yes, okay. I'll take that as a comment right now. Is your hand up sir? Go ahead, second time around.

Josephine Powers: I just want to ask Graham, who was hired, your nomination person, who was hired as your Cultural Officer?

Graham: Our regional archeologist, her name is Amy Wood.

Roger: I am going to take the liberty now to put up a question. I heard this morning about something that was really relevant to someone like myself, a lay person, coming into the process. And Nancy, I am going to put you on the spot, because you answered it. But how an alternative is created, you weigh in with your options, who actually makes the decision? Didn't you say that there is a person down in Hadley that makes the decision? Because we all wonder, we make the



effort to come out to meetings, we submit our comments, and we kind of wonder how is that decision made? If you don't mind, repeat what you said during this morning's session.

Nancy: Sure.

Roger: Thank you.

Nancy: So, the decision maker on this environmental assessment is the Regional Chief of the Refuge System in the Northeast, and that is Scott Kahan, K A H A N. And, he has been apprised, he has read this environmental assessment. He is out of town right now. But he will be interested in what went on tonight and who was here. And as a team, we will be responsible for compiling all the comments that came in, whether they came in tonight or in writing or by Facebook, and writing a response to comments that come in and share them with him for his decision. One thing that came up this afternoon as well that I wanted to point out is, there was a gentleman that spoke, he said, "I really like say alternative A, but I also liked this aspect of alternative B." I would encourage you, if you have a similar situation with an alternative in mind that might include bits and pieces among the other alternatives, to go ahead and submit that as your comment, that you would like this combination of actions, that maybe we did not analyze in the EA, and why. That substantiation of why would be really helpful for us in addressing your comments. If you picked up a comment form you see on the bottom some hints we have in submitting your comments that helps us. It's challenging to respond to your comments or address your comments if you just voice an opinion without some rationale that we can address. So, we appreciate some rationale with your comments. And in addition, you can pick and choose some actions and if you would like to, but to also explain why you want to, that would be helpful to us too.

Roger: Thank you, thank you very much.

Ward: Along the lines of that decision making, in the beginning of the EA there is the Purpose and Need section. There is a list of 10 items that is what this decision maker, the Refuge Chief, that is what he will be looking at. So, you get to look at the same thing he will be looking at.

**Statements from Attendees on the Environmental Assessment (Transcription)**

Roger: Ok, we are going to close our little Q & A. We are going to just listen to you. If you have comments you want to echo, sir, you had a comment earlier, you were concerned about the other regulatory agencies. This is the chance to just let us hear. We are recording, we have the recorder going. We really want to hear from you, that is why we are doing this. This won't be a Q & A like what we just had, but if you have things on your mind that you have been reading in the report or just in general, as stakeholders in the area, speak now please. Who wants to be first?

Sara Carter: I do.

Roger: You were first last time. (Laughter). You sit in the front row. Thank you for going first, we appreciate it.

Sara Carter: Sara Carter, I am interested in knowing if there will be any plans to expand the parking that's available for the existing trails. That is something that I would like to see happen. And the other thing that I would like...Can I do two comments?

Roger: I think so.

Sara Carter: The other thing I would like considered is the effect of weather on our decisions. If we are going to preserve something that is so close to the ocean, what kind of considerations are there for raising global sea level and for the predicted increase and severity of weather? How is that being included in the plans of whether or not to preserve...

Roger: Was that last point, is that cleared up?

Ward: I think both of the things you mentioned, we sure tried to cover in the EA. The fact that I thought that I wrote it doesn't necessarily mean you'd get the same interpretations from reading it. But, I think you'll find it in the EA, both for climate change, for sea level rise, and our plans for parking.

Roger: I just wanted to be sure that's clear what you said. Anyone else? Yes sir. Do you want to embellish on that point you made earlier? You talked about what your thought was on regulations.

Bill Durkin: Well, again, I am Bill Durkin. I have been involved with this project since the beginning. I am also President of Friends of Rachel Carson National Wildlife Refuge, as well.

Roger: Oh, great!

Bill Durkin: Way back, when we were looking...Number 1, the owners, the past owners, the Ewings were great conservation minded proponents. They were great where they didn't expand. Years ago, before zoning came out, they could have cut it up and put in 60 or 40 lots and cashed in, but they didn't do that. They bought the original house with the farm house, and then they built this back in 1930. The farmhouse is from the late 1700s. Jo, what is it?

Bill Durkin: 1700. I think so. And we, with the Kennebunkport Conservation Trust, Trust for Public Lands, and the Friends of Rachel Carson, essentially worked out a deal with the Ewings to buy the 98 acres for \$5.2 million. We got help with the Congressionals to obtain \$3 million with Land and Water Conservation Funds and then we raised private funds. We raised \$2 million for the balance of the funds. And as part of that process, we took everybody out for a walk on the land because this is a unique project, we usually only work to buy land with Land and Water Conservation Fund and don't usually get involved with private fundraising, but in this case we did. So, we took people out to show them what we were buying. And everybody always asked,

“Well, what is going to happen with the house? Is it staying, or is it going?” We really didn’t have an answer at that time. Rachel Carson Refuge couldn’t make any guess on that either because it really wasn’t their land yet. So, once we got a hold of the miraculous deal that happened, the first thing we did was build that trail. So, we have the trail out there for the public to use. Normally you don’t get public access in national wildlife refuges. Anyway, as Ward said earlier, it’s for wildlife, we manage habitat for wildlife. So, occasionally at Rachel Carson Refuge, I think we have four or five spots in all 11 divisions from Kittery up to Cape Elizabeth, where we have access for the public. So, we established this trail for the public because they were also involved in donating funds. But all along, we were wondering what was going on with the houses. And eventually Ward came up with this environmental assessment. It is very thorough and the options are all pretty much laid out. I haven’t, the Friends haven’t, come up with a statement yet, but the question was with C alternative. If it is to be used, that house, if there would be a change in use in the house, where with the overnight stays, again I was asking about land use permitting. I don’t know if that use would be allowed. It would have to go through the whole planning board process – you would have to get conditional uses, you’d have to expand the road, the causeway would have to be blown out to 20 or 30 feet to get 250 feet to the high water line for shoreline zoning. And, the last picture that Ward showed up there, that classic driveway to the house, what is now a National Recreational Trail...that would not exist anymore if we were going to indeed change that house into alternative C. We would have to blow that road out 20 feet. They would have to move the walking trail also. So there would be a lot of things that go into that whole alternative. That’s why I asked the question, is it really feasible? Is it really an alternative if you’ve got to go through that whole process? But then again, Feds can get involved and just do carte blanche, and just do what they want. I mean there was this building that was part of the Biddeford Pool Division, what was the name of that property? Dyer House. There was a classic building that had 4 or 5 bedrooms, it was off Old Pool Road. Ward had this idea to make it into an environmental education center, and put up a 10 parking lot area. And, so I said “Ward we’ve gotta have a meeting about this.” So we had a public meeting and a couple of months later Ward said, “No, we are not going to do it”, because there was a lot of opposition to that because of what would happen to the traffic out there, change in use, all that stuff. So eventually, the refuge moved that historic building to someplace else.

Roger: Excellent. Thank you very much for that. Before we go to people that have already spoken, anyone else? A new face. Go ahead. Your name please.

Eileen Foley: Eileen Foley. I had a question.

Roger: Thank you Eileen.

Eileen: I had a question for the numbers that were given for alternative C. I think it was \$3.2 million.

Ward: Yes.

Eileen: Okay. Would that be for the road and for the renovation of the building, or is that just the building?

Ward: We think that is the renovation price. So it does include the building and we got that number from the building assessment study. And the road has to be...right now cars can't pass on that road, so we would have to widen the road. And we have a road czar, an engineer, who is in the regional office, and so that is where we got the information.

Eileen: Okay, I was just trying to understand... just the money. I was thinking about how we use this road tonight, this gravel road. I don't know if its wide enough for two cars to go by for the size of it, its use, and I was just trying to get a bigger picture, the amount of use. So I was just trying to get an idea of what \$3.2 million was getting you, was it getting you state of the art? Or is it getting by with what we have?

Ward: I have been working for Fish and Wildlife forever and we don't buy Cadillacs. We buy Chevy's. We don't buy state of the art.

Roger: If you want to phrase that into a statement that would be very helpful if you could write it down, if you are concerned about that.

Eileen: I was just trying to understand what the money could cover, would it cover a range of improvements? What would you get for that amount of money?

Roger: Okay.

Eileen: And I wasn't sure where the emphasis would be...on upgrading the road? Parking? And then bringing the building up to code or minimal code or minimal qualifications, or will you be doing a major overhaul of the building and then putting in gravel road and gravel parking? I was just kind of wondering about that.

Roger: Yeah, maybe that is a question we should capture. The statement would be that you are curious about the breakdown of the costs for that \$3.2 million. I don't know if they have that, but that would be that question we would record, or at least that as a comment, and then hopefully you will get a response to that.

Nancy: We can visit after, and I can show you how we summarize that in the document.

Eileen. Sure, okay. Thank you.

Roger: Uh oh, visiting after, you got called up. (Crowd laughter). I am just kidding. More comments please, back in the back room there. You guys came in a little late over here. Any comments of what you've seen? Any thoughts? Its comments now. You could still comment later in writing. Yes, with your hand up? Ma'am.

Susan Swanton: My name is Susan Swanton from Biddeford. Would you mind if I read a comment from someone who couldn't be here tonight, before I make a comment of my own?

Roger: I think that is very reasonable. As long as it is not put in the form of a question.

Susan: It's not a question.

Roger: Then you can submit it after this as well, if you'd like. Thank you. Or should I say, how long is it?

Susan: Not long. Not long.

Roger: Okay, before I say yes. Alright, thank you.

Susan: And this comes from Lisa Barstow, a neighbor of mine on Old Pool Road. "As a lifelong resident and year round resident of Biddeford Pool, I am in very much in favor of the vision for a Timber Point Center. I visited the house and the grounds, and can see that this magnificent property would be a special addition to the refuge...a gathering place for people who are of a like mind, concerning the environment, ecology, and the arts. The property being used for community retreats, would in my opinion (side note: this is Lisa's opinion), enhance the objectives of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, bringing the natural world, and the human, also a part of the natural world, together organically. I think of writers such as Gary Snyder and Terry Tempest Williams, whose ability was to commune with the natural world poetically, as well as intellectually bring the rest of us closer to it, as well. This property used for retreats would prove to be a "Sense of Place" would be given to each person. I believe that Timber Point Center would be a positive and welcome addition to what is already in place. In this century, when the business of life is already too amplified, the possibility of retreat in such a beautiful setting would bring ease and gratitude for generations to come." And she also said, "It's time to think outside the box."

Roger: And that name was?

Susan: Lisa Barstow. My personal comment is about the process for these meetings. I found it really disheartening, that despite the fact of the entirety of that property is located in Biddeford, there has not been a public meeting scheduled in Biddeford. Tonight is the night that the City Council meets. There are at least nine people on that council who might have liked to have been here tonight, but they couldn't because they are doing their work as representatives of the city. And the people who attend that meeting are also precluded from this process, which I think would have been helpful in terms of the questions that have been posed, and the answers that have been given. And, I certainly would ask that you would consider doing a meeting in Biddeford, which is where the property is. I really have to say I take offense to the fact that Biddeford has been pretty much been neglected in this process. Thank you.

Roger: Thank you. Do you want to hand that other piece in?

Susan: She mailed it today I guess.

Roger: Do you want to submit it?

Susan: No, she's given me a photocopy and it is not easy to read.

Nancy: She's mailed a copy directly to us?

Susan: She sent it directly.

Roger: Okay. So, we will take that as a comment and hopefully they will respond to that in their responses. The hand behind...

Virginia McCrae: Virginia McCrae from Kennebunkport. I just want to say I support...I support alternative D. My husband and I made the largest donation in our life to purchase the property, and it was to have a wildlife preserve. And I think, maintaining the house is not cost effective. It's going to deteriorate as time goes on, and it will cost more money. And, removing it gives it a chance to have more wildlife there. I think it is important to have that piece and not maintain a house that is only going to deteriorate as time goes on that costs more money. And, that is what I am for, alternative D.

Roger: That was D? Good, thank you very much for that very clear statement. Yes ma'am.

Aurelie Wallach: I am chair of the Historic Preservation Commission for the city of Biddeford and its for preservation, of course. I would like to see the house stand. I'd like to see it preserved. I'd like other people to enjoy it and learn something about it. I think it is an excellent place to learn about ecology, wildlife, and architecture, and so forth. That's my comment.

Roger: Thank you very much. Yes, go ahead.

Josephine Power: You can cut me off when you want, mine is long. I'm Josephine Power, and I'm the founder of Timber Point Center and my words are not advocating for Timber Point Center, but speaking to the process, including the environmental assessment. The Timber Point Environmental Assessment is a 60 page document with a lot of misleading information. I encourage you to read the details. As an example, the word "estimated" is used 24 times, the word "possible" is used eight times, "possibly" 17, "near" is used 21 and "may" is used 42 times. The use of these vague, non-definitive words are in reference to wildlife and financial subjects, not a whole lot of harder facts are offered. A great deal of verbiage is written about wildlife, none of which exists on the property. On page 60, the document states that agencies were contacted for the EA. Maine Inland Fisheries and Wildlife confirmed twice that they had not been contacted, and actually when asked, they had no comment. Maine Preservation received one email and one phone call, and neither person from Maine Preservation, who had been working on the preservation of these National Historic Register eligible buildings, was ever spoken with. As Executive Director of Timber Point Center, I was not contacted for the EA, and

emails to the refuge requesting simple information, like the format for tonight's meeting or who the Cultural Officer would be who would be conducting today's tour, went unanswered. And there wasn't a tour today. The buildings were opened up. If Timber Point Center, which really is between Option B and C, had been consulted, we would have assisted the refuge in developing a legitimate, adaptive use concept, as we have been working on this project since 2009. Trust for Public Land and the refuge were approached in 2011. At the time of the June 27, 2011 meeting, the refuge manager stated he would entertain the idea. These meetings occurred before the fundraising campaign got under way. Timber Point Center, had we been contacted, would have suggested an offsite parking solution for the refuge, regardless of the alternative chosen. The refuge is a 100-acre public property open 7 days a week with six parking spots. The buildings are not the cause of parking and transportation issues. The refuge needs to look at an offsite solution to the current problem. We would have questioned the need to take any land for a parking lot when the Timber Point Center plan does not require one, and the Ewing family had weddings that didn't need a parking lot there either. We would have seriously questioned the \$3 plus million dollar estimate, when our financials prepared by professional business consultants, were \$2 million dollars less, and that included the Timber Point business and renovations. We would have also suggested and encouraged them to read the "Vision for the Future, Wildlife Refuges in the Next Generation". It's the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's road map that encourages partnerships and thinking outside the box, and has as one of its three overarching goals, "Creating a connected conservation constituency", a central role of Timber Point Center. If the refuge and Service had really been interested in proposing a legitimate adaptive reuse alternative, not one that is written so biasedly that no one would choose it, they would have contacted TPC and had a conversation about the features TPC offered that aligned with the mission and goals of the Service and would have minimal impact with the environment. Unlike the thinly "disguised to fail alternative C" that the Service proposed. In regards to a tour, I want to be clear that the refuge states that they conducted a tour last summer and today, and there has never been a tour conducted at Timber Point. There's never been a cultural resource officer there to share with the public the architectural, historical, and cultural significance. TTOR architects, who prepared the nomination, offered the refuge and the Service their services to conduct guided tours for this EA, for this process. And they were never, never responded to. Approximately 15 people spoke earlier today of not wanting adaptive reuse of the building, and they state correctly that as neighbors, they are the most affected by the refuge. However, Timber Point Center, excuse me, Timber Point, is not an expanded backyard for the neighborhood. It is public land. None of the neighbors have ever wanted to listen to any of the facts about Timber Point Center. Timber Point Center modeled the minimally impactful programming over the past year when it had three programs on the Ewing property. The participants were vanned to the property. They were so unimpactful that the neighborhood was unaware that these events had occurred. At a time of dwindling public access to beaches and the oceanfront, when the price of renting on or near the ocean is unattainable for most, disallowing a thoughtful, adaptive reuse of the building for small meetings and retreats, for programming for the public to learn about the natural and historic

landscape associated with the property, for people to be lulled to sleep by the ocean at a writing conference, environmental or artist retreat, or who would otherwise not have access, and for the preservation of these National Historic Preservation eligible buildings, would be a crime and opposite of what public lands and public buildings are all about.

Roger: How much more do you have?

Josephine: I can't read my writing, so that is probably is all of it.

Roger: Hopefully we can, so submit it please. Do you want to summarize very briefly what your...?

Josephine: Oh, I do want to say that earlier today, a gentleman spoke about not thinking the building was anything special or something, and that Charles Ewing wasn't anyone that was highly regarded. But Nitrate Shoals (?) is already on the National Historic Register and that was, it was actually a district that Charles Ewing designed. So, he is actually a very well-known architect. And, the historian Richard Chaffee said that the Timber Point building was actually a masterpiece. So, I think that should be understood by everyone. Oh, one more thing. And, then I promise to be done. Maine Preservation, at the request of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in 2012, prepared a very, very detailed list of actions that should occur to preserve the buildings, even while all of this was taking place. And very little has been done from that list to preserve the buildings. So, in reality, if option A and B, if the refuge is going to take care of the buildings the way they have been done before, or a little better, ultimately A and B will equal D, which is that the buildings will be demolished by neglect anyway. Now I am done.

Roger: Alright, we have 45 minutes. Yes, hello there.

Susan Amons: Susan Amons again. I had a remark that because last weekend my husband and I attended the Maine Preservation Annual Meeting and they showed slides of the most endangered buildings in the area and the very last one was Timber Point. And that made me cry.

Nancy: What meeting was that?

Susan Amons: Maine Preservation. Does everyone know what endangered means? My husband doesn't think so.

Unidentified male speaker: It means they've identified buildings that are of architectural significance and are at risk of being destroyed or removed.

Roger: So, we still have plenty of time. Anyone have anything you have heard tonight about the EA process? I knew it, I had a feeling!!! Ha, ha, ha.

Unidentified female speaker: This is a comment. I understand that if an historic building on the Registry is moved, it loses its label or that significant symbol.



Susan Amons: I don't believe so. It doesn't have to be in situ. We have lots of historic buildings in the country that have been moved.

Nancy: I think it depends on why it was listed because sometimes the setting is part of the integrity of the site and its reason for listing. So it depends on the final eligibility criteria that were used. Sometimes you can move it intact, but it also could be that it is listed because it is part of that particular setting, so the setting is important to the listing.

Roger: Okay, anybody else.

Josephine: One more. Also, I just want to say that Timber Point Center does not require taxpayer money.

Unidentified female speaker: Is it because it is for profit making?

Josephine: No, it's a nonprofit.

Roger: So we are going to close the comment period and there will be people here that we heard speak that we have plenty of time, if you want to speak afterwards, please do. I just want to remind everyone to fill out those little forms. Some people got, some didn't, on their way in the door. But, those are very important for those who did not hear earlier, those people that do the reviewing will see those very soon and then the committee will look at them as well. And also make sure, as Ward had mentioned, make sure that we have your emails, write them down as you were coming in or write them down on the way out, because that is how we will let you know the process, how it's playing out. And, as I said this afternoon, this EA process is often cumbersome and convoluted and confusing, especially for us lay people that don't do it frequently. But you guys make it happen. Stakeholders that have come out, on a rainy night no less, and want to have your say and have an input is huge. That is what democracy is all about. I know that may seem kind of trite in this day and age, but you guys are living examples, like small town meetings. So, I am really proud of you, thank you for doing it. So if there are any other final comments, Ward or Nancy?

Nancy: October 31 is the end of the public comment period.

Roger: October 31 it will close. So, thank you. Please stay around and talk to us. Thank you everyone.